DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 432 914 FL 025 930

AUTHOR	King, Kendall A.
TITLE	Language Ideologies and Heritage Language Education.
PUB DATE	1999-03-00
NOTE	40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics (21st, Stamford, CT, March 1999).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Foreign Countries; *Heritage Education; *Indigenous Populations; Interviews; *Language Attitudes; *Language Role; *Native Language Instruction; *Quechua
IDENTIFIERS	Ecuador

ABSTRACT

The divergent Quichua language ideologies existing among an indigenous group of the southern Ecuadorian Andes mountains are examined. Analysis of data from 51 interviews with indigenous highlanders, including parents, teachers, school administrators, and political leaders, reveals the existence of two conflicting Quichua language ideologies: one characterized by loyalty to Quichua and great value attached to the language, particularly in private and humorous situations and in traditional contexts; and the other characterized by the beliefs that bilingualism is onerous, by contempt for subordinated, non-standard languages (such as Quichua), and by a linguistic "survival of the fittest" attitude. Each element of this last, Western language ideology was also present in the population interviewed. A belief that children prefer Spanish to Quichua was found, and Spanish was the dominant language of home use. Implications for endangered language communities are considered. (Contains 39 reference) (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 432 914

Language ideologies and heritage language education

Kendall A. King

Stockholm University
New York University

Paper presented at the American Association of Applied Linguistics
Stamford, CT 1999

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Kendall King

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FL025930

Abstract

This paper explores the divergent Quichua language ideologies which exist among an indigenous group of the southern Ecuadorian Andes. Analysis of data from fifty-one interviews with indigenous highlanders reveals the existence of two conflicting Quichua language ideologies. Through discussion of these disparate ideologies, this paper seeks to add to our understanding of language attitudes and language behavior in the face of language shift, and in particular to provide insight into how communities' language ideologies are critical to the success of heritage language programs, and ultimately, language revitalization efforts.

This paper explores the divergent and conflicting Quichua language ideologies which exist among the Saraguros, an indigenous group of the southern Ecuadorian Andes. Through discussion of these disparate ideologies, this paper seeks to add to our understanding of language attitudes and language behavior in the face of language shift, and in particular to provide insight into how communities' language ideologies are critical to the success of heritage language programs, and ultimately, language revitalization efforts.

Across a range of social science disciplines and wide variety of contexts, a common paradox that arises in studies of attitudes and behavior is that there are often fundamental differences between individuals' expressed attitudes towards an object and their actual behavior surrounding that object (Azjen & Fishbein, 1980: 17-18). Of particular interest here is the fact that individuals often express attitudes about language which seem incompatible with their language behavior (Baker, 1992: 12-13). For instance, sociolinguistic studies of Irish have found that despite holding high opinions of Irish, few individuals are willing to speak the language regularly and even fewer consistently use the language with their children at home (Benton, 1986; Ó Riagáin, 1996). As Paulston notes, Irish "people may perceive Irish as having a very high symbolic value for the nation, without at the same time being willing or able to use it in daily discourse" (1994: 86). These findings parallel data from Wales, where one study found that 86% of parents believe Welsh is important and want their children to learn it (Lyon & Elis, 1991), but far fewer parents use the language regularly with their children. These inconsistencies between expressed

language attitudes and actual language behavior suggest that the explicit statements made by participants concerning their own language attitudes merit further investigation.

Greater understanding of the disparity between language attitudes and language behavior is of particular importance for advocates of language revitalization and planners of heritage language education programs. In many language loss and revitalization contexts, it is common for community members to articulate pro-revitalization rhetoric, yet concomitantly, *not* use the endangered language in daily life. Of course, if language revitalization efforts are to succeed in meeting their primary aim of expanding language use, it is vital that those who know the language actually use it in daily life. As the Dauenhauers (1998: 97) point rightly out, "language reversal cannot be done *to* one or *for* one by others," but rather requires that individuals move beyond mere discussion of language use and endeavor to employ the threatened language in a range of contexts.

While not all heritage language programs involve use of *threatened* languages (for instance, those that teach Spanish in the United States do not), most heritage language programs are concerned with maintaining or increasing levels of use of a minority language. In general, "heritage or maintenance language education refers to the education of language minority children through their minority and majority language" (Baker, 1996: 185). Such programs "stress the value of bilingual and multilingual skills for the individual," as well as for the society as a whole (Cummins, 1995: 137). Frequently cited examples include the use of Maori in schools in New Zealand

and Aboriginal languages in Australia (Spolsky, 1989; Caldwell & Berthold, 1995, in Baker, 1996). Yet even the Maori heritage language programs, which are often touted as success stories, are limited in the claims they can make concerning overall increases in Maori use (Spolsky, 1995). Indeed, such shifts towards expanded use of the threatened language often remain an elusive goal. An important first step in facilitating greater use of the threatened language, then, may be to acquire a deeper understanding of why this shift seems to be so difficult and in fact, only rarely made.

In this paper, I argue that the inconsistencies reported between language attitudes and language behavior can best be understood when the broader notion of language ideology is taken into account. In order to explore the relevance of language ideology for language attitude data, the two should first be clearly differentiated. As Baker notes, the difference between the terms is "partly about different traditions in research, theory, and expression" (1992: 14). While much of the research on language attitudes is embedded within the field of social psychology (e.g. Gardner, 1985; Gardner & Lambert, 1972), studies of language ideology tend to be linked with sociology and anthropology (e.g. Rumsey, 1990; Schieffelin, Woolard & Kroskrity, 1998; Silverstein, 1979).

Generally speaking, an attitude is directed toward a specific object. Azjen, for instance, defines attitude as a "disposition to respond favourably or unfavourably to an object, person, institution, or event" (1988: 4; in Baker, 1992: 11). Ideology, in contrast, tends to refer to a broader system of beliefs, norms, or values. Silverstein's frequently cited definition delineates language ideology as "sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or

justification of perceived language structure and use" (1979: 193). Similarly, although somewhat more broadly, Rumsey views language ideology as "shared bodies of commonsense notions about the nature of language in the world" (1990: 346; in Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994: 57).[1] Thus, while a language attitude is usually conceived of as a specific response to certain aspects of a particular language, language ideology is an integrated system of beliefs concerning a language, or possibly language in general.

Including the analysis of language ideology in the inquiry into the gap between language attitudes and language behavior is essential. It has been suggested that language ideology is the mediating link between language use and social organization (Hornberger, in press; Kroskrity, in Woolard & Schieffelin, 1994: 72; Woolard, 1998). If language ideology is in fact a site of interaction between language behavior on the one hand, and larger social systems and inequalities on the other, it would then play a crucial role in understanding the differences described above between expressed language attitudes and observed language behavior. More to the point, overt, expressed language attitudes may only reveal *one* of several existing language ideologies which are present in the community and which influence behavior. As will be clear in the discussion which follows, there may well be other language ideologies present as the result of wider social relations and inequalities which also impact linguistic choices, yet nevertheless remain infrequently articulated.

This paper is divided into four parts. First, I provide an overview of the context of the study and the research project. Second, through analysis of language attitude interview data, I outline the various ways in which Saraguros value

Quichua and analyze what can be described as the 'pro-Quichua' ideology which is present in the community. In the third section, using the same data, I describe how Quichua is simultaneously devalued by Saraguros in their daily lives, and examine the contrasting, but co-existing 'anti-Quichua' ideology among Saraguros. Fourth and finally, I analyze how the distribution of these two ideologies varies by community in conjunction with the uneven socio-economic changes in the region, and conclude by discussing the implications of these finding for language revitalization advocates and heritage language education planners.

The context of the study

The Saraguros are an indigenous group numbering roughly 22,000. They primarily reside in approximately sixty rural communities scattered around the largely white town of Saraguro in the southern highlands of Ecuador. The Saraguros are members of the Quichua nation, yet constitute an ethnically distinct group whose particular clothing and hair style identifies them both nationally and locally. Despite the maintenance of a clearly delineated indigenous identity, Saraguros have shifted away from Quichua and presently tend to be Spanish dominant. In recent years, many Saraguros have found this state of affairs troubling (that is, being indigenous, yet not regularly speaking an indigenous language) and have attempted to revitalize Quichua as a spoken language within their communities.

This study is concerned with two Saraguro communities in particular: Lagunas and Tambopamba. Like nearly all communities in the midst of linguistic shift,

language competencies in Lagunas and Tambopamba vary by age. In both communities, the oldest members tend to be Quichua dominant, and the younger residents Spanish dominant or Spanish monolingual. However, the communities differ in important ways. Tambopamba is relatively isolated, and perhaps related to this fact, language shift has not progressed as far in Tambopamba as it has in many other Saraguro communities. While Spanish dominates in most Tambopamba contexts, Quichua is also regularly employed. In contrast, the community of Lagunas, which lies close to town and adjacent to the Pan American highway, has shifted much further towards Spanish monolingualism, with only the very eldest members regularly using Quichua. Concomitantly, language revitalization efforts are better supported and more firmly established in Lagunas.

Before turning to discussion of the interview data, several points should be made clear. First, the present discussion forms part of a larger investigation of language revitalization among the Saraguros (XXXX, in press). That study involved one year of participant observation in the communities, homes, and schools of Saraguros, as well as extended formal and informal interviews with community members. The ethnographic inquiry conducted that year focused on language use and instruction, as well as language and ethnicity attitudes.

A second and related point is that largely because the interviews were part of a broader ethnographic research project, the extent to which the answers can be believed is reasonably high. This is the case for the following reasons.

(1) The interviews were carried out only after I had been in the community for a period of at least six months, thus allowing the interviewees to know me reasonably well.

(2) Furthermore, the interviewees were all individuals with whom I had established close and collaborative relationships, for instance, by helping them in their gardens or assisting with their or their children's home work.

(3) Finally, my own observations of the interviewees during the course of their daily lives allowed me to ascertain the veracity of many of the answers they provided.

The final point that should be stressed is that all of the interviews were carried out in an open-ended and informal manner. While guidelines were used to frame the interviews, the varied directions which the conversations took were entirely up to the interviewees. Thus, while many of the quotations below are direct answers to direct questions, others are comments which were spontaneously offered during the course of the conversations.

Fifty-one interviews were conducted with parents, teachers, school administrators, and political leaders in the two communities. Of these, thirty consisted of interviews with parents in Tambopamba and Lagunas (fifteen each); sixteen were interviews with teachers, education administrators, and school principals; and five were interviews with community and regional political leaders. Thirty of the interviewees were women; twenty-one of the interviewees were male. All interviewees were between the ages of nineteen and fifty-seven. In addition, a small number of the quotes below are taken

from informal conversations with community members. These quotations are marked by their date and fieldnote (FN) number; interview quotations are followed by their tape (T) number. The language of the quotation is identified as either Quichua (/Q/) or Spanish (/S/), and followed by its English translation.

'Pro-Quichua ideology' in Saraguro

Turning now to the interview data, explicit statements by Saraguros in the two communities clearly suggest that members are loyal to Quichua, and indeed that they give great importance to the language. Interviewees mentioned several specific reasons for valuing Quichua, which ranged from the language's beauty, to its usefulness for communicating with elders, and to the importance of the language for marking Saraguro identity.

These findings in many ways parallel data from indigenous communities in neighboring Peru. Hornberger (1988), in a paper on language ideology in the southern Peruvian province of Puno, notes that while community members recognize the greater prestige and wider functional utility of Spanish, the language of wider communication in Peru, they also greatly value Quechua.[2] Specifically, she reports that the language ideology of Quechua speakers in the region includes valuing Quechua:

(1) as the best language for "informal, private, and humorous situations" (224);

(2) as the language appropriate for the *ayllu* domain, which includes "all those social situations pertaining to traditional community life" (224);

(3) as the primary oral channel of communication; and

(4) for aesthetic and emotional reasons, "as a means of sentimental attachment to the Quechua community" (226).

Following Hornberger's framework for organizing the expressed attitudes towards Quechua, first we should note that like Quechua of Puno, Quichua is valued by Saraguros as the preferred language for informal, private, and humorous situations. Members of both communities were quick to point out that Quichua was the best language *"para reirnos"* ('in order to make ourselves laugh' /S/) (T 15a: Lagunas mother). Some members went so far as to say that Quichua was used *"más por decir una broma, un chiste"* ('more for kidding around, saying a joke' /S/) and that things were simply *"más chistoso"* ('funnier' /S/) in Quichua than in Spanish (T 20b: Tambopamba mother).

Second, Quichua is valued for use in traditional settings, namely at *fiestas* ('parties' /S/) and *mingas* ('communal work parties' /Q/).[3] Both of these are perceived to be 'traditional,' indigenous settings. The *minga* is an important event for practical reasons, serving as a central source of labor for public and private work projects, but also for symbolic reasons, as a form of collaboration and organization specific to indigenous groups in the region. Similarly, although *fiesta* is a Spanish loan word, community parties are perceived as an integral part of indigenous life and ritual. Many members, especially those of Tambopamba, cited these two contexts as ones where Quichua is valued and

appropriate for use. As the president of the community of Tambopamba explained, *"en una fiesta, en una minga, se usa más"* ('in a party, in a *minga* one uses [Quichua] more' /S/) (T 21b).

Third, while Quichua is not solely associated with oral communication, and Spanish no longer exclusively affiliated with written text, Saraguros, like Quechua speakers of Puno, Peru, value Quichua as a means of oral communication with elder relatives and community members.

> *Para hablar con los mayores, así que no comprenden, para que entienden, para contestar cuando vengan.*
> ('In order to talk with the elders, when they don't understand [Spanish], in order that they understand, to respond when they come.' /S/) (T 25b: Tambopamba mother)

> *Hablo quichua con abuelito.*
> ('I speak Quichua with [my] grandfather.' /S/) (T 12a: Tambopamba mother)

> *En el momento de estar con los mayores, se usa más.*
> ('When one is with the elders, one uses [Quichua] more.' /S/) (T 10b: Tambopamba mother)

Many Saraguros valued Quichua for communication with the small number of elders in Lagunas and numerous adults over the age of sixty in Tambopamba who tended to be Quichua dominant. While not a widely used channel of oral

communication (the dearth of Quichua proficiency precluded this), Quichua is valued as a necessary means of communicating with these Quichua-dominant elders.

The final parallel with Hornberger's findings in Peru concerns the aesthetic value and sentimental attachment to the language. Like the Quechua of highland Peru, Saraguros report that they value the language for providing an emotional link to the past.

> *Porque los ante abuelos han sabido hablar quichua, entonces para no hacer desaparecer este costumbre así siguimos hablando.*
> ('Because our ancestors have known how to speak Quichua, so in order to not make this custom disappear, we continue speaking like this.' /S/) (T 12b: Tambopamba mother)

> *Una de las herencias que nos han dejado nuestros antepasados es el idioma. Por naturaleza tenemos que practicar.*
> ('Part of the inheritance that our ancestors have left us is the language. Naturally, we have to continue the custom.' /S/) (T 14a: Lagunas mother)

> *Así, pues, no queremos perder el costumbre que tienen mis abuelos de antes.*
> ('So then, well, we don't want to lose the customs of my ancestors.' /S/) (T 5a: Lagunas mother)

> *Es uno de los retratos de la herencia cultural.*

('It is one of the traits of our cultural heritage.' /S/) (T 14a: Lagunas mother)

De Vos (1975) argues that a critical component of ethnicity is its role in maintaining a sense of connection and continuity with the past. As the above quotes suggest, many Saraguro interviewees strongly associate Quichua with past generations and their traditional practices, and accordingly, value the language for maintaining this link.

Saraguros, then, seem to value Quichua in many of the same ways as those of Puno, Peru (Hornberger, 1988), namely for use in private and humorous situations, in traditional contexts, for communicating orally with elders, and as the language of sentimental attachment to Quichua ancestors. However, in contrast to the Puno highlanders, the 'pro-Quichua' language ideology articulated by Saraguros also suggests an acute awareness of the importance of the language for marking Saraguro indigenous identity. In particular, members from Lagunas frequently expressed consciousness of the role that Quichua plays in signaling and even maintaining their ethnic identity. Indeed, for many Saraguros, and especially for those of Lagunas, Quichua serves as a lynch pin of indigenous ethnicity.

Sin idioma sería como no hubiera indígenas; no hay nada.
('Without language it would be as if there weren't indigenous people; there isn't anything.' /S/) (T 8b: Lagunas mother)

[Si el idioma disaperzca], perderíamos una parte de la identidad de los Saraguros.

('[If the language disappears], we would lose a part of the identity of the Saraguros.'/S/) (T 13b: Tambopamba father)

Sería como corriente común—por eso estamos luchando rescatar, recuperar, rescatar.

('It would be becoming like everyone else—this is why we are fighting to rescue, to recuperate, to rescue.' /S/) (T 6a: Lagunas mother)

Thus, while the language attitudes expressed by Saraguro members of both communities suggest the presence of a similar language ideology as that of Quechua speakers in Puno, Saraguro language ideology is also characterized by an awareness of the language's role in marking and possibly even maintaining ethnic identity. Saraguro language ideology, then, consists not only of valuing the language for specific functions and the emotional connection that the language provides, but also of a conscious and often well-articulated awareness of the symbolic importance of the language.

This finding sharply contrasts with that of Hornberger's study of bilingual communities in Peru, none of which were immediately threatened with language loss. Hornberger argues that while the Quechua of her study were strongly and indeed, paśsionately loyal to their language, they were also "largely unconscious of their loyalty to Quechua" (1988: 227). She explains that "for many community members Quechua culture and the Quechua language are not something you think about, they are simply a way of life" (227).

However, a point which is highly relevant for the Saraguro case is that greater consciousness of the language was apparent among some of the more highly educated Puno interviewees. She notes that for Quechua professionals, namely teachers, the process of becoming educated has forced them to confront "the non-Quechua larger society and in that process...become more aware of Quechua culture and the Quechua language as entities" (226).

Similarly, as Saraguros have individually and collectively engaged with non-indigenous Ecuadorian society, they too have become politically conscious of their position as an ethnolinguistic minority in the context of a larger nation-state. While this is true of many indigenous groups in Ecuador, it is perhaps particularly so for Saraguros, who are one of the more economically successful groups in the country and who have been politically organized and active for more than three decades. For instance, the former president of the prominent national indigenous organization, the *Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas de Ecuador* ('Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador' /S/ or CONAIE), and former senator, Dr. Luis Macas, hails from Saraguro.

One possible explanation for the explicit and conscious value of Quichua as an ethnic marker lies in the fact that Quichua language revitalization rhetoric is intimately linked with the political discourse of the region. Many political meetings include discussions of the importance of teaching and using Quichua, and often incorporate phatic use of the language as well. This political discourse concerning the right and importance of using Quichua has thus become part of the 'pro-Quichua' ideology of the region, as evidenced by many of the quotes above. However, the 'pro-Quichua' ideology is not the only

17

Saraguro language ideology. As the following section explores, while less overt and less obvious, there are also attitudes which conflict with these positive and public orientations towards Quichua.

'Anti-Quichua' Ideology

As the discussion above suggests, Quichua is seemingly highly valued by Saraguros. Indeed, nearly all community members expressed positive attitudes towards Quichua in one form or another. However, interviews also reveal other attitudes which seem to contradict the above, and which suggest the existence of an alternative, 'anti-Quichua' ideology. Indeed, a central component of the argument of this paper is that despite the sentiments outlined above, the language behavior of Saraguros is deeply influenced by a competing, 'negative' language ideology. This Saraguro ideology in many respects fits with what Nancy Dorian has characterized as 'Western language ideology' (1998).

Dorian (1998) argues that in order for patterns of language loss in Europe and the Americas to be fully understood, the power of language ideology, and in particular, Western language ideology, must be taken into account. In her view, Western language ideology, part and parcel of the cultural heritage the Europeans brought to the New World, undermined the normal tendency of language prestige to promote language maintenance. While the discussion of 'colonial' or 'Western' language ideology is hardly new (e.g. Fabian, 1986; Mignolo, 1992; in Woolard, 1998), Dorian's conceptualization of it is particularly clear. For her, Western language ideology consists of a related

system of beliefs based on three central premises: (1) certainty that bilingualism is onerous; (2) contempt for subordinated, non-standardized languages; and (3) social Darwinism of language, or a linguistic "survival of the fittest" which has encouraged Europeans to "assume a correlation between adaptive and expressive capacity in a language and that language's survival and spread" (1998: 10). It is obvious how such an ideology would be incompatible with the peaceful coexistence of indigenous and European languages, and in Dorian's view, Western language ideology was an important factor in the eventual demise of many of the indigenous languages of the Americas. Indeed, Dorian argues that not only did the particular language ideology brought by Europeans to their conquered territories influence the attitudes of indigenous peoples there, but that it ultimately undermined the prestige of, as well as loyalty to their languages.

Examination of the interview data from Saraguro reveals that each of the three components of 'Western language ideology' as outlined by Dorian are clearly present. Turning first to the belief that bilingualism is onerous, among Saraguros, this is manifest in a concern not just that children learn Spanish first and best, but that concomitant acquisition of Quichua would hinder this process. Parents seem to believe that they must 'choose' between the two languages, with nearly all opting for Spanish.

Many parents in both communities, although especially those in Tambopamba, expressed concern that their children learn to speak Spanish as their primary language. Indeed, parents tend to believe not only that Spanish is important for

their children, but that their children prefer and have a natural tendency to speak Spanish.

> *En ese tiempo están más acostumbrados de hablar sólo castellano–antes era en el Quichua.*
> ('In this period they are more accustomed to speaking only Castilian–before it was in Quichua.'/S/) (T 12b: Tambopamba mother)

> *Hasta ahoritas castellano–poco a poco quichua.*
> ('Up until now, Spanish–little by little Quichua.'/S/) (T 6a: Lagunas mother)

> *Porque sólo hablan castellano. Ya no toman punto principal pero como L2.*
> ('Because they only speak Castilian. Now [the children] don't take [Quichua] as the starting point, but as L2.'/S/) (T 23b: Tambopamba father)

The belief that children prefer Spanish clearly holds implications for language socialization and language use with children. Kulick, for instance, observes that Gapun parents, who reside in an isolated rural village in Papua New Guinea, believe that children no longer prefer to speak the native community language, Taiap, and thus adjust their language accordingly (1992). In Saraguro, the belief that Spanish is preferred by children translates into the tendency for parents to use Spanish exclusively with Saraguro children in the home and family domains. And as parents in both communities are quick to point out, Spanish is the dominant language of the home.

No estamos hablando quichua todo los días en la casa.
('We aren't speaking Quichua every day in the house.' /S/) (T 17a: Lagunas mother)

En esta casa somos jovenes. No practicamos mucho.
('In this house we are young. We don't practice the custom much.' /S/) (T 6a: Lagunas mother)

Indeed, most interviewees in Tambopamba and *all* interviewees in Lagunas reported that Spanish is the language *"que se use con más frecuencia en la casa"* ('that one uses most frequently in the home' /S/).

It should be noted, however, that the dearth of Quichua use and concomitant importance given to Spanish, does not mean that parents do not wish for their children to acquire Quichua. In fact, many parents speak of hopes that their children will learn the language through formal study at school or when they are *"más mayores"* ('older' /S/). However, the belief that bilingualism is onerous, at least for young children if not for adults, entails indefinitely delaying exposure until one language, inevitably Spanish, is fully developed.

The second two components of 'Western language ideology' are closely related, and are discussed here together. The first of these is the notion that non-standardized, non-official languages are inferior. As Dorian explains, "Europeans who came from polities with a history of standardizing and promoting just one high-prestige speech form carried their 'ideology of contempt' for subordinate languages with them when they conquered far-flung

territories, to the serious detriment of indigenous languages" (1998: 9). This belief in the inherent superiority of standardized European languages is further supported by the application of Darwinian notions. Of course, such notions are self-serving, reinforcing the view that expanding and dominating languages, such as Spanish and English, are linguistically superior, while contracting, dominated indigenous languages not only inferior, but incapable for use in complex communication and especially poorly suited to rational thinking and clear expression.

These two related ideologies are reflected in a number of ways in comments made by Saraguros. Perhaps most obviously, Saraguros from both communities are quick to reveal their linguistic insecurity, or at least acute awareness of their (perceived) lack of language skills.

> *Saben hablar un poco más–nosotros medio mezclado.*
> ('They [whites] know how to speak a little more–we [speak] somewhat mixed.'/S/) (T 9a: Tambopamba mother)

> *Ellos de repente correcto. No hablamos bien como ellos.*
> ('They [whites] often [speak] correctly. We don't speak well like them.'/S/) (T 10b: Tambopamba mother)

Sadly, nearly all Saraguros find a reason to be ashamed or insecure about their language skills. While those of Tambopamba express concern over their Quichua-influenced Spanish, as in the quotations immediately above, Lagunas members are anxious over their lack of Quichua fluency.

Es el malo de nosotros que no sabemos el quichua.
('It's the bad thing about us that we don't know Quichua.' /S/) (FN 29: 10-8-94)

Es una lengua nativa de nosotros y debemos saber pero lástimamente no sabemos.
('It is a native language for us and we should know, but unfortunately, we don't.' /S/) (T 19b: Lagunas mother).

Furthermore, the colonial ideologies of contempt and superiority outlined above are also apparent in the comments by members concerning Spanish's higher prestige, wider use, and ultimately greater worth.

Para poder hablar asi. Para cuales no quieren, no se puede con gente blanca. Rechazan a nosotros por no hablar castellano.
('In order to be able to speak like this. Those that don't want to, can't [speak] with white people. They reject us for not speaking Castilian.' /S/) (T 25b: Tambopamba mother)

El castellano es mas importante.
('Spanish is more important.' /S/) (T 11a: Tambopamba mother)

These attitudes seem especially common among the elder Saraguros, who are recognized as having a deeply internalized sense of linguistic inferiority.

Los mayores tienen vergüenza hablar en esa forma.

('The elders are ashamed to speak in the [Quichua] manner.' /S/) (T 4a/4b: Lagunas father)

Nuestros abuelos no querían que seamos Quichuas, que seamos castellanos.

('Our grandparents did not want us to be Quichuas; [they wanted] for us to be Castilians.' (T 14b: Lagunas mother)

Younger members are perhaps less likely to explicitly articulate this 'anti-Quichua' ideology, but there were other signs of its presence. Indeed, as the vignette below suggests, for some, especially those of Tambopamba, the link between Spanish and social, economic, and educational success is a strong one, and knowledge of Quichua is viewed as incompatible with many pursuits.

Outside a storefront near the center of Tambopamba a slightly drunk man approaches and begins a conversation with me and my companion. He tells us repeatedly that he has three children—all of whom are bachilleratos *('secondary school graduates' /S/) and one of whom is studying at a university in Cuenca. When I ask if the children know or speak Quichua, he laughs at what seems to him to be an ridiculous question and answers that no, of course they don't, they* "tienen grados" *('have degrees' /S/). (FN: 516: 12-20-94)*

For this man, as for many in the community of Tambopamba, the notion that a Quichua speaker could achieve academic success is far fetched and even

laughable. Not surprisingly given this fact, the majority of Tambopamba parents feel that Spanish is *"más importante"* ('more important' /S/) for their children than Quichua. Thus, while parents stress that Quichua is beautiful and needed for certain functions, Spanish competence symbolically represents and is practically important for social and economic success and mobility. Conversely, knowledge of Quichua tends to be equated with lack of education and limited economic success.

Thus, as the above quotations suggest, despite the frequently articulated 'pro-Quichua' statements, there is also evidence of the existence of a competing, 'anti-Quichua' language ideology as well. This 'anti-Quichua' ideology likely has been shaped by the notions of language brought to the Americas by the Spanish, or by what Dorian has termed 'Western language ideology' (1998). In the following and final section of the paper, I consider how these competing ideologies are distributed in the two different communities, as well as the implications of these findings for language revitalization advocates and planners

Ideological clarification and language revitalization

Distribution of ideologies

As has been noted in the text above, the communities of Tambopamba and Lagunas are not identical, and the distribution of the two conflicting ideologies outlined here is unequal. As might be predicted given the characteristics of each of the communities, 'pro-Quichua' ideology tends to dominate in

Lagunas, while 'anti-Quichua' ideology appears to be more common in Tambopamba.

This varied distribution is understandable in light of the uneven positions of the two communities. For the last several decades, Lagunas has been intensively engaged in political, social, and economic interactions with non-indigenous society. And in recent years, Lagunas members have enjoyed educational and professional success in traditionally non-indigenous sectors. Not surprisingly, shift towards Spanish has progressed much further within this community. Yet as Lagunas members have moved towards educational and professional integration with non-indigenous society, they concomitantly have become conscious of the importance of maintaining their ethnic identity, and in particular of the key role that Quichua might play in doing so. In Smolicz's terminology, for Lagunas members, language is a 'core value' (1981; 1992); it is one of the "identifying values that are symbolic of the group and its membership" (1992: 279). For Lagunas members, who have had access to Spanish for many decades, Spanish fluency is wide-spread, and even taken for granted. For them, it is Quichua which is the object of concern. As a result, Lagunas language revitalization efforts have been well-supported, at least in terms of the public discourse surrounding them, for at least the last decade.

Tambopamba, in contrast, lies further away from the town and main road, and has been more isolated, not only from Spanish speakers and state education efforts, but also from political organization and discourse. Related to this is the fact that Tambopamba members have not attained high status positions in non-indigenous society. For example, very few members have completed high

school, and only a handful of members occupy professional or skilled positions. Shift towards Spanish has not progressed as far, and indeed, many members feel that their Spanish skills are lacking. In Tambopamba, it is Quichua, not Spanish, which is taken for granted. Correspondingly, language revitalization efforts are not as widely supported as they are in Lagunas.

Given the many differences between the two Saraguro communities, it is not surprising that the two ideologies discussed above are not equally represented. As Hornberger (1988) points out, interaction with wider, non-indigenous society tends to stimulate greater awareness of issues of language, culture, and identity. Furthermore, as noted above, both the need for language revitalization and pro-Quichua sentiment are important aspects of the political rhetoric of the region. Thus, given these facts, and the position of Lagunas as one of the better educated, more profession, and most political communities in Saraguro, it is not surprising the 'pro-Quichua' ideology appears to be more dominant in Lagunas, while 'anti-Quichua' ideology seems to prevail in Tambopamba.

Prior to leaving the comparison of the two communities, it seems important to note a final intriguing difference concerning the varied prominence of the two ideologies on the one hand, and actual language use patterns on the other. As Fishman observed more than three decades ago in a study of language use and attitudes among Eastern and Southern European immigrants to the United States, there seems to be a negative correlation between expression of positive attitudes toward the immigrant tongue and use of that tongue. In other words,

27

as use of the immigrant language declined, positive sentiment towards that language grew more common (Fishman, 1964; in Hornberger, 1988).

These findings in some respects parallel the Saraguro data. In Lagunas, where 'pro-Quichua' ideology tends to dominate, the language is used relatively infrequently and largely restricted to occasional, phatic and symbolic use. Conversely, in Tambopamba, where 'anti-Quichua' ideology is more common, the language is still used for a number of purposes in daily life, for example, for personal and humorous communication, and for talk with members of the older generations. Thus, as language use declines, it seems that individuals, at least in Saraguro, tend to become more aware of the language's fragile position, and concerned about its possible disappearance, both of which appear to translate into conscious appreciation of the language.

Two ironies

Before turning to the implications of these findings for language revitalization planners and advocates, two ironies merit mention. First, as Woolard and Schieffelin suggest, it is paradoxical that movements to save minority languages are "often structured around the same notions of language that have led to their oppression and/or suppression" (1994: 60). Woolard and Schieffelin are primarily referring to the long-standing European tradition of equating one language with one nation. The irony with reference to language revitalization initiatives is that while the one language-one nation doctrine has led to the oppression and in some cases extinction of indigenous languages in colonial and post-colonial situations, this same doctrine has also been adopted by

threatened language groups in the attempt to rally support for their threatened tongues. As Woolard explains, "movements to save minority languages ironically are often structured, willy-nilly, around the same received notions of language that have led to their oppression and/or suppression" (1998: 17). This tendency is apparent in some of the 'pro-Quichua' statements above which suggest that because Quichua is the native language of Saraguros, knowledge of it is a prerequisite to Saraguro ethnic membership. Such a position, which Myhill identifies as a "language-and-identity" ideology, "emphasises the inherent emotional and spiritual connection between a person and his/her native language (or in some cases the language of his/her immediate ancestors)" (1999: 34).

However, this close association between language and ethnic identity is a double-edged sword for some Saraguros. On the one hand, Lagunas members' fixation on Quichua allows for a handy and semiotically powerful "symbolic resource" for ethnic identity maintenance (Bourdieu, 1991; in Urciuoli, 1995: 534). Yet on the other hand, given the community's lack of competence in Quichua, this fixation on Quichua is also the source of tension and anxiety. As noted above, Lagunas members are keenly aware of the contradictions inherent in the fact that they define an indigenous person as one who speaks Quichua, and furthermore define themselves as indigenous Saraguros, yet are for the most part Spanish dominant, if not Spanish monolinguals.

Dorian points out a second, and not unrelated irony. Namely, while the attitudes of descendants of the settlers and the conquered of the 'new world' are "still largely infected with earlier European language ideologies...all unfavorable to the survival

of smaller indigenous languages" (1998: 19-20), European policies and organizations, and in particular the European Union (EU), have in recent years been a source of support for certain smaller and minority languages. Indeed, the fifteen-country EU functions in eleven official languages. Protecting and supporting each of these comes at an enormous cost; with 1,900 full-time translator and interpreters, the EU maintains the largest translation staff in the world (Simons, 1999). With the establishment of the EU, an "unyielding adherence to the national-language ideology has given rise to unprecedented European support for multilingualism, and in an overspill of protective enthusiasm for smaller languages" (Dorian, 1998: 19). Thus, the long-standing notion equating one language with one culture—which previously served to undermine the stability of minority languages, and in many areas continues to do so—in recent years, has served to bolster and perhaps even strengthen certain minority languages within the European context.

Implications

Lastly, but perhaps most importantly, we turn to the implications and relevance of the above discussion for endangered language communities. The Dauenhauers, in a discussion of their work with indigenous languages of Southern Alaska, describe the conflicting messages which can be understood as the result of 'positive' and 'negative' language ideologies (1998). They suggest that not only are these conflicting messages apparent in verbal discussions about language revitalization initiatives and heritage language programs, but they are also manifest in lack of support for them. They note that indigenous students in fact experience "mixed messages" about the value of learning their

native tongue (1998: 67). For instance, "on the one hand, it is being taught, and people are saying that it is good to learn it; but on the other hand, the student is aware of the overwhelming anxiety and negative associations surrounding the language, whether spoken or unspoken" (1998: 67). They conclude that given these mixed messages, or what have been described here as conflicting language ideologies, "it should come as no surprise to discover a disparity between expressed ideals and actual support" for language revitalization initiatives (1998: 67). In other words, in light of the competing ideologies surrounding Quichua, it is understandable how individuals may articulate a 'pro-Quichua' ideology, yet use the language infrequently at home, among their family, and in particular with their children.

In order to close this gap, Fishman stresses that "to begin with, even before concrete efforts are undertaken...[language revitalization] involves 'consciousness heightening and reformation,'" or what Fishman terms, 'ideological clarification' (1990: 17). Fishman warns that such a process is far from simple and almost always controversial, and furthermore must involve extended dialogues among not only those who are proponents of language revitalization, but with those who are opposed to it as well. As the Dauenhauers usefully explain, ideological clarification "calls for an open, honest assessment of the state of the language and how people really feel about using and preserving it, replacing wishful thinking and denial of reality with an honest evaluation leading to realistic recommendation" (1998: 63). They stress that individual and community attitudes concerning these issues are "as important as—if not more important than—the technical aspects that are less emotional" (1998: 63). As Stroud (in press) has suggested in his discussion of

the problems of bilingual education in Africa, while technical short-comings are often cited as the reasons for failure, the true problem often lies in the lack of 'ownership' of the program by its targeted community.

Drawing from decades of experience, the Dauenhauers note that the process of ideological clarification fundamentally entails answering the question, "Do we *really* want to preserve Tlingit, Haida, or Tsimshian language or culture?" (1998: 62). They go on to note that while the politically and emotionally correct answer is a resounding "Yes!", the reality is more complicated.

> The underlying and lingering fears, anxieties, and insecurities over traditional language and culture suggest that the answer may really be, "No". What does a "Yes" answer mean? We often find those who vote "Yes" to 'save the language and culture' expect someone else to 'save' it for others, with no personal effort, commitment, or involvement of the voter. (Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer, 1998: 63)

Clearly the process of ideological clarification is extremely complicated and involves addressing attitudes and feelings on many levels. Furthermore, it also is important to stress that because altering language behaviors entails addressing large and long-standing ideological systems, we should not be surprised that they are resistant to change. As Dorian has observed, "it requires enormous social and psychological self-confidence for any small group to insist on the importance of ancestral-language retention...Precisely that sort of self-confidence is hard to come by in communities which have suffered the penalties of an ideology of contempt over a long period" (1998: 20). Thus, in the case of the Saraguro communities, active participation in language

revitalization means overcoming an ideology which has existed and influenced the communities for hundreds of years. It is therefore to be expected that 'anti-Quichua' ideology continues to manifest itself, and indeed to hinder actual support for language revitalization, despite the highly visible 'pro-Quichua' rhetoric.

Lastly, while scholars have argued that it is essential that 'ideological clarification' take place *before* initiatives get underway (e.g. Dauenhauer & Dauenhauer, 1998; Fishman, 1990; 1991), the opposite point could also be made. That is language revitalization initiatives in and of themselves can have the effect of bolstering a community's self-confidence and enhancing attitudes towards the threatened language (Dorian, 1987). In a similar vein, Hornberger notes of heritage language and literacy initiatives in the Americas, such efforts are empowering, confirming "indigenous identity, language, and culture, while simultaneously promoting development and modernization for the indigenous peoples" (1996: 361). While it is clear the attitudes and ideologies of a threatened language community are of critical importance, it may be the case that post-poning the initiation of efforts to revitalize the language until everyone is of the same (and positive) mind, may in fact be ensuring the demise of the language, and possibly the community as well. Rather, communities may do well to commence with efforts to instruct and use the language which are feasible and practical, while continuing on the long, and perhaps never ending road to Fishman's ideological clarification.[4]

Endnotes

[1] Both Silverstein and Rumsey employ the term 'linguistic ideology' rather than 'language ideology.' Following Woolard and Schieffelin (1994: 56), I use them interchangeably here.

[2] *Quechua* is the term used to refer to the varieties spoken in Peru and Bolivia; it is also the cover term for all varieties of the language. *Quichua*, in contrast, is used for varieties spoken in Ecuador and northern Chile. The difference in terms has to do with the differing phonological evolution of the language in Ecuador, as compared to the other countries. In the former case, the uvular stop /q/ has been lost, and with it the lowering of the /i/ vowel to /e/ in proximity to the /q/. Keeping with established use, throughout this paper Quichua is used to refer to the Ecuadorians varieties in general and the indigenous language of Saraguro in particular, while Quechua refers to the Peruvian varieties of the language.

[3] Note that while *minga* is a Quichua word, the term is widely used by indigenous and non-indigenous Spanish speakers. When borrowed into Spanish, the Spanish pluralizing morpheme, *s*, rather than the Quichua, *cuna*, is regularly applied.

[4] This paper was written while visiting the Centre for Research on Bilingualism at Stockholm University during the 1998-1999 academic year. Thanks are due to the Centre's seminar participants for their helpful comments on an earlier draft, especially Kenneth Hyltenstam and Maria Wingstedt, and to the School of Education at New York University for granting me leave. I also wish to extend a special thanks

to my former advisor and permanent mentor, Nancy Hornberger, whose research and inter-disciplinary approach continues to greatly shape my own.

References

Azjen, I. and Fishbein, M. (1980) *Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behaviour*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Baker, C. (1992) *Attitudes and Language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Baker, C. (1996) *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Benton, R. A. (1986) Schools as agents for language revival in Ireland and New Zealand. In B. Spolsky (ed.) *Language and Education in Multilingual Settings* (pp. 33-76). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bourdieu, P. (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Caldwell, J. and Berthold, M. (1995) Aspects of bilingual education in Australia. In B.M. Jones and P.S.S. Ghuman (eds) *Bilingualism, Education, and Identity*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.

Cummins, J. (1995) Heritage language teaching in Canadian schools. In C. Baker (ed.) *Policy and Practice in Bilingual Education: Extending the Foundations*. (pp. 134-138). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Dauenhauer, N. M. and Dauenhauer, R. (1998) Technical, emotional, and ideological issues in reversing language shift: examples from Southeast Alaska. In L. A. Grenoble and L. J. Whaley (eds) *Endangered Languages: Current Issues and Future Prospects* (pp. 57-116). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

De Vos, G. (1975) Ethnic pluralism: conflict and accommodation. In G. De Vos and L. Romanucci-Ross (eds) *Ethnic Identity: Cultural Continuities and Change* (pp. 5-41). Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.

Dorian, N. (1987) The value of language-maintenance efforts which are unlikely to succeed. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 68, 57-67.

Dorian, N. (1998) Western language ideologies and small-language prospects. In L. Grenoble and L. Whaley (eds.) *Endangered Languages: Current Issues and Future Prospects* (pp. 3-21). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fabian, J. (1986) *Language and Colonial Power: The Appropriation of Swahili in the Former Belgian Congo 1880-1938*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fishman, J. A. (1964) Language maintenance and language shift as fields of inquiry. *Linguistics* 9, 32-70.

Fishman, J. A. (1990) What is reversing language shift (RLS) and how can it succeed? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 11 (1 & 2), 5-36.

Fishman. J. A. (1991) *Reversing Language Shift*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Gardner, R. C. (1985) *Social Psychology and Second Language Learning*. London: E. Arnold.

Gardner, R. C. and Lambert, W. E. (1972) *Attitudes and Motivation in Second-Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Hornberger, N. H. (1988) Language ideology in Quechua communities of Puno, Peru. *Anthropological Linguistics* 30 (2), 214-235.

Hornberger, N. H. (1996) Language planning from the bottom up. In N. H. Hornberger (ed) *Indigenous Literacies in the Americas: Language Planning from the Bottom Up* (pp. 357-366). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hornberger, N. H. (in press) Bilingual education policy and practice in the Andes: Ideological paradox and intercultural possibility. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*.

Kulick, D. (1992) *Language Shift and Cultural Reproduction: Socialization, Self, and Syncretism in a Papua New Guinea Village*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyon, J. and Ellis, N. (1991) Parental attitudes towards the Welsh language. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 12 (4), 239-251.

Mignolo, W. D. (1992) On the colonization of Amerindian languages and memories: Renaissance theories of writing and the discontinuity of the classical tradition. *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 30, 301-330.

Myhill, J. (1999) Identity, territoriality, and minority language survival. *Journal of Multilingual Multicultural Development* 20 (1), 34-50.

Ó Riagáin, P. (1996) Reviving the Irish language 1983-1993: The First Hundred Years. In M. Craith (ed.) *Watching One's Tongue: Issues in Language Planning* (pp. 33-56). Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Paulston, C. B. (1994) *Linguistic Minorities in Multilingual Settings. Implications for Language Policies.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Rumsey, A. (1990) Wording, meaning, and linguistic ideology. *American Anthropologist* 92 (2), 346-61.

Schieffelin, B. B., Woolard, K. A., and Kroskrity, P. W. (eds) (1998) *Language Ideologies. Practice and Theory.* New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Silverstein, M. (1979) Language structure and linguistic ideology. In R. Clyne, W. Hanks, and C. Hofbauer (eds) *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistic Units and Levels* (pp. 219-259). Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Simons, M. (1999) EU's Tower of Babel. *International Harold Tribune.* February 26-27.

Smolicz, J. J. (1981) Core values and cultural identity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 4 (1), 75-90.

Smolicz, J. J. (1992) Minority language as core values of ethnic cultures. In W. Fase, K. Jaspaert, and S. Kroon (eds) *Maintenance and Loss of Minority Languages.* (pp. 278-305). John Benjamins Publishing Company: Philadelphia, PA.

Spolsky, B. (1989) Maori bilingual education and language revitalization. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 10 (2), 89-106.

Spolsky, B. (1995) Conditions for language revitalization: A comparison of the cases of Hebrew and Maori. *Current Issues in Language and Society,* 2 (3): 177-201.

Stroud, C. (in press) Language and democracy: The notion of linguistic citizenship and mother tongue programs. *Proceedings from the LASU Conference on Language and Democracy in Africa.*

Urciuoli, B. (1995) Language and borders. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24, 525-546.

Woolard, K. A. (1998) Introduction: Language ideology as a field of inquiry. In B. Schieffelin, K. Woolard, and P. Kroskrity (eds) *Language Ideologies. Practice and Theory* (pp. 3-47). New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Woolard, K. A. and Schieffelin, B. B. (1994) Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23, 55-82.

XXXX, K. A. (in press) *Language Revitalization Processes and Prospects: Quichua in the Ecuadorian Andes.* Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters Press.